

# **2011 WorldSkills Australia School / College Metal & Engineering Competition MLS11/5 Judges' Instructions**

---

## **Judges' Instructions**

**This is essential reading. Please take the time to read these notes carefully.**

The aim of this project is two fold:

- Firstly it is a WorldSkills competition that ranks competitors according to the skills demonstrated on the day.
- Secondly, it is an assessment of competence to given competency standards, in this case:

MEM 1.4FA	Plan to undertake routine task
MEM 1.2FA	Occupational Health & Safety
MEM 2.1C12A	Apply Quality Procedures
MEM 1.3FA	Plan & Undertake a Task
MEM 2.5CIIA	Measure with Graduated Devices
MEM 9.2AA	Interpret Technical Drawing
MEM 18.1AA	Use of Hand Tools
MEM 2.8C10A	Perform Computations
MEM 18.2 AA	Use of Power Tools

Thus aside from a WorldSkills competition, it is envisaged that this project may prove to be a useful and practical assessment tool that TAFE teachers will be able to incorporate into their courses at various levels.

## **Some points about marking this project:**

1. It is preferable that the same judges be present for the duration of the competition.
2. Points may only be awarded as indicated on point allocation sheets: no splitting of scores is permitted.
3. The marking criteria are found on the marking scale beside each entry point. In some cases you will also find the criteria on the plans as a guide to competitors and on marking guide drawings within the marking scale.
4. Competency and Rankings, please read the pages 2 & 3. These describe how competency is assessed in the marking scale and how achievement or non-achievement of competency affects a competitor's ranking.

# 2011 WorldSkills Australia School / College Metal & Engineering Competition MLS11/5 Judges' Instructions

---

5. Please encourage competitors to check their rules and tapes against the standard [assessor's rule or tape] prior to commencement.
6. Definitions: Page 3 has some notes on wording used in the marking scale and on the competitor's plans. It is worthwhile being familiar with them.

## **Competency Assessment**

Competency may only be awarded when a student or competitor has achieved a "yes" in **ALL** of those qualities highlighted in the marking scale.

Key qualities amounting to competency have been highlighted as example below:

<b>Finish</b>				<b>Key Qualities</b>
<b>Quality Checked</b>	<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	
File & Hammer marks	None	2	0	
Marking Blue removed	None [Assessor's Discretion]	1	0	
Fits/Sizes/Completed Work	None [Assessor's Discretion]	3	0	
		<b>Score 6</b>		

The qualities of producing finished work unmarked by hammer blows and without vice marks is critical to competent performance and hence are highlighted as such. The other qualities of cleanliness of the finished work, whilst highly desirable does not detract sufficiently for the demonstrated competency to eliminate the award. That is to say that the other qualities are either of an advanced nature, or that they are likely to cause only such error as may be rectified easily without reducing the overall outcome. Such qualities are hence 'desirable' but not essential to someone 'competently' doing the task.

It is also possible to gain one competency and not the other.

**Note:** A high score does not necessarily indicate competence.

## **Competency and Rankings**

Whilst assessed competency does not impact upon score, assessed competency does impact upon ranking.

- 1st, 2nd and 3rd places shall only be awarded to those who have also been assessed through the marking scale as competent.
- Irrespective of score those assessed as competent will be ranked above those who did not achieve competency.

# 2011 WorldSkills Australia School / College Metal & Engineering Competition MLS11/5 Judges' Instructions

---

## **Example 1:**

John Smith gains a score of 78% [the highest score] but fails in one or more elements of competency.

Marg Jones gains a score of 70% [the second highest score] and achieves all elements of competency.

Marg Jones is ranked 1st.

## **Example 2:**

John Smith gains a score of 78% [the highest score] but fails in one or more elements of competency.

Jim, Phil, Loris, Niki & Brian all score below John, [irrespective of the margin] and all achieve competency.

John is ranked **below** Jim, Phil, Loris, Niki & Brian. John is only placed higher than next highest scoring competitor who did not gain competency.

## **Some Notes on Wording in the Marking Scale and Plans**

**Please note the following definitions:**

- **‘Competitor’s discretion’** - Example: Competitors may choose to fasten members using any of the fasteners supplied. However competitors may lose marks if such fixing is poorly done, or the situation called for something other than that which they chose to use, or if the specifications or plans indicated otherwise.
- **‘As Drawn’** - This applies particularly to joints but is sometimes used in determining the position of something. In the case of joints; Joints that are deemed to be not at least similar in type [ie. a tenon if a tenon was called for, a housing if a housing was called for etc.] **are not be assessed** further. i.e. **no points are awarded** for that joint.
- **‘Fit’** - Fit may be assessed using a feeler gauge where necessary [but is not obligatory]. Allowance specified is for the central 95% of the length of joint faces:

Please note that the specification of 95% is nominal only – you are not in the least expected to calculate or measure this - its sole purpose is to allow the judge the ability of awarding a valid score for an otherwise tight joint that may have a very small gap or chip at one end

- **‘Assessor’s discretion’** – Requires assessor to decide whether or not points should be awarded on a given issue ie. fastening quality/appropriateness. This decision is based upon the assessor’s trade experience and the circumstances of the situation.

**Material Replacement, Excess orders and “Late” orders**

This is a competency assessment and thus the necessity to replace materials would ordinarily indicate a lack of said competence. In this instance however, additional material is permissible at a points cost of 2 per item.

- Materials ordered during event will incur the same penalty as replacement value.

**No points shall be deducted for the following substitution or replacement**

- When that material may be regarded as incidental to the task when the material is of poor quality or has been damaged through no fault of the competitor.